

REMARKS

Interview

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Polansky for discussing the pending rejections with Applicants' representative on October 10 and 12, 2011. The content of the interview is presented in the amendments to the claims and in the remarks below.

Status of the Claims

The claims have been amended, support for which can be found throughout the specification and in the claims as originally filed. The amendments to the claims do not add new matter. Claims 1, 3, 12-14, 16-18, and 20-22 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter contained therein.

Drawings

The drawings were objected to for the quality of Figure 1 as set forth on page 2 of the office action. Applicants concurrently submit a replacement set of drawings. Applicants respectfully request this objection be withdrawn.

Claim Objections

Claims 21 and 22 were objected to for allegedly being of improper dependent form. Without acquiescing to the merits of the objection, Applicants have cancelled claims 21 and 22 without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter contained therein. Accordingly, Applicants submit that this objection is moot.

Enablement

Claims 1, 7, 8, 10-12, 18, 21, 24, and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, because the specification allegedly fails to enable the full scope of the claimed invention. Claims 2, 13, 19 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, because the specification allegedly fails to enable the full scope of the claimed invention.

Without acquiescing to the merits of the rejections, Applicants have herein amended the claims to better capture certain commercial aspects of the claimed invention. The claims, as amended, are directed to methods of inhibiting the activity of p56^{lck} molecule by administering either compound 73, 276, or 285. Applicants respectfully submit that the specification fully enables the full scope of the currently amended claims. As discussed during the interview, the specification enables a method of inhibiting the binding of a p56^{lck} molecule via an SH2 domain thereof to a corresponding cellular binding protein, or inhibiting the activity of a p56^{lck} molecule via an SH2 domain thereof by administering one of these three compounds. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, are enabled by the specification. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and enablement rejection. Should the Examiner find that an interview would be helpful to further prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at his convenience.

Date: **November 9, 2011**
Morgan Lewis & Bockius LLP
Customer No. **09629**
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Tel. No.: 202-739-3000

By: /Zachary Derbyshire/
Zachary Derbyshire
Registration No. 64669
Tel. No.: (202) 739-5698
Fax No.: (202) 739-3001